

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/957,187

Applicant(s)
Beer et al.

Examiner
Sheeba Ahmed

Group Art Unit
1773



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sheeba Ahmed

(3) _____

(2) Grace Pan

(4) _____

Date of Interview Oct 3, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: All under consideration

Identification of prior art discussed:

Hirose

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The attorney of record, Ms. Pan, indicated that Hirose fails to disclose the water vapor permeation, the puncture resistance and the thickness which are all variables and can therefore be varied. Ms. Pan indicated that comparative data may be presented to overcome the rejection of record. The Examiner, in response, pointed out that Hirose does in fact disclose the same laminate having the same thickness as that of the claimed invention and that the Examiner has taken the position that the water vapor permeation and puncture resistance of Hirose and that of the claimed invention are therefore identical. The Examiner indicated that objective data would have to be presented to conclusively show that the claimed product is in fact different from the prior art product. No definite agreement on patentability was reached.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.

Sheeba Ahmed
10/3/2000
SHEEBA AHMED
PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1773